

I-166 COUNTY RESULTS					
County	FOR	AGAINST	TTL VOTES	FOR %	AGAINST %
Beaverhead	3303	1266	4569	72.3%	27.7%
Big Horn	3045	1281	4326	70.4%	29.6%
Blaine	1913	807	2720	70.3%	29.7%
Broadwater	2015	783	2798	72.0%	28.0%
Carbon	4168	1433	5601	74.4%	25.6%
Carter	447	279	726	61.6%	38.4%
Cascade	24279	7605	31884	76.1%	23.9%
Chouteau	1912	733	2645	72.3%	27.7%
Custer	3631	1446	5077	71.5%	28.5%
Daniels	578	290	868	66.6%	33.4%
Dawson	2866	1287	4153	69.0%	31.0%
Deer Lodge	3324	944	4268	77.9%	22.1%
Fallon	884	366	1250	70.7%	29.3%
Fergus	4013	1612	5625	71.3%	28.7%
Flathead	30169	11180	41349	73.0%	27.0%
Gallatin	34861	10641	45502	76.6%	23.4%
Garfield	456	176	632	72.2%	27.8%
Glacier	2887	1266	4153	69.5%	30.5%
Golden Valley	286	172	458	62.4%	37.6%
Granite	1159	423	1582	73.3%	26.7%
Hill	4875	1553	6428	75.8%	24.2%
Jefferson	4535	1670	6205	73.1%	26.9%
Judith Basin	739	399	1138	64.9%	35.1%
Lake	9566	3093	12659	75.6%	24.4%
Lewis & Clark	24497	7494	31991	76.6%	23.4%
Liberty	621	304	925	67.1%	32.9%
Lincoln	6268	2182	8450	74.2%	25.8%
Madison	3144	1178	4322	72.7%	27.3%

I-166 COUNTY RESULTS (cont.)					
County	FOR	AGAINST	TTL VOTES	FOR %	AGAINST %
McCone	612	320	932	65.7%	34.3%
Meagher	676	235	911	74.2%	25.8%
Mineral	1405	511	1916	73.3%	26.7%
Missoula	44102	10978	55080	80.1%	19.9%
Musselshell	1547	729	2276	68.0%	32.0%
Park	6261	2165	8426	74.3%	25.7%
Petroleum	209	80	289	72.3%	27.7%
Phillips	1446	663	2109	68.6%	31.4%
Pondera	1813	765	2578	70.3%	29.7%
Powder River	480	471	951	50.5%	49.5%
Powell	1916	710	2626	73.0%	27.0%
Prairie	444	220	664	66.9%	33.1%
Ravalli	15135	6073	21208	71.4%	28.6%
Richland	2967	1378	4345	68.3%	31.7%
Roosevelt	2483	928	3411	72.8%	27.2%
Rosebud	2483	914	3397	73.1%	26.9%
Sanders	4254	1394	5648	75.3%	24.7%
Sheridan	1263	477	1740	72.6%	27.4%
Silver Bow	12648	3503	16151	78.3%	21.7%
Stillwater	3167	1344	4511	70.2%	29.8%
Sweet Grass	1352	625	1977	68.4%	31.6%
Teton	2212	861	3073	72.0%	28.0%
Toole	1412	590	2002	70.5%	29.5%
Treasure	288	134	422	68.2%	31.8%
Valley	2674	915	3589	74.5%	25.5%
Wheatland	659	269	928	71.0%	29.0%
Wibaux	337	144	481	70.1%	29.9%
Yellowstone	48873	17270	66143	73.9%	26.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>343559</b>	<b>116529</b>	<b>460088</b>	<b>74.7%</b>	<b>25.3%</b>

Information prepared and provided by Matt Leow, Stand with Montanans, mleow@mrss.com, 406-370-3183

I-166 HD RESULTS						
DIST.	LNAME	FNAME	PARTY	CITY	FOR I-166	AGAINST I-166
HD 01	Bennett	Gerald	R	Libby	76%	24%
HD 02	Cuffe	Mike	R	Eureka	73%	27%
HD 03	O'Neil	Jerry	R	Columbia Falls	76%	24%
HD 04	Lieser	Ed	D	Whitefish	77%	23%
HD 05	Regier	Keith	R	Kalispell	70%	30%
HD 06	Glimm	Carl	R	Kila	72%	28%
HD 07	Brodehl	Randy	R	Kalispell	73%	27%
HD 08	Lavin	Steve	R	Kalispell	77%	23%
HD 09	Reichner	Scott	R	Bigfork	71%	29%
HD 10	Blasdel	Mark	R	Somers	72%	28%
HD 11	Hertz	Greg	R	Polson	75%	25%
HD 12	Salomon	Daniel	R	Ronan	76%	24%
HD 13	Ingraham	Pat	R	Thompson Falls	75%	25%
HD 14	Schwaderer	Nicholas	R	Superior	63%	37%
HD 15	Calf Boss Ribs	Frosty	D	Heart Butte	75%	25%
HD 16	Whitford	Lea	D	Cut Bank	69%	31%
HD 17	Clark	Christy	R	Choteau	54%	46%
HD 18	O'Hara	Jesse	R	Great Falls	73%	27%
HD 19	Hagan	Roger	R	Great Falls	74%	26%
HD 20	Fitzpatrick	Steve	R	Great Falls	68%	32%
HD 21	Price	Jean	D	Great Falls	78%	22%
HD 22	Schreiner	Casey	D	Great Falls	79%	21%
HD 23	Boland	Carlie	D	Great Falls	79%	21%
HD 24	Hoven	Brian	R	Great Falls	80%	20%
HD 25	Jacobson	Tom	D	Great Falls	78%	22%
HD 26	Mehlhoff	Robert	D	Great Falls	78%	22%
HD 27	Cook	Rob	R	Brady	70%	30%
HD 28	Hollandsworth	Roy	R	Brady	70%	30%
HD 29	Osmundson	Ryan	R	Buffalo	70%	30%
HD 30	Harris	Bill	R	Mosby	70%	30%
HD 31	Smith	Bridget	D	Wolf Point	74%	26%
HD 32	Brockie	Clarena	D	Harlem	70%	30%
HD 33	Hansen	Kristin	R	Havre	77%	23%
HD 34	Warburton	Wendy	R	Havre	74%	26%
HD 35	Lang	Mike	R	Malta	72%	28%
HD 36	Knudsen	Austin	R	Culbertson	71%	29%
HD 37	Halvorson	David	R	Sidney	67%	33%
HD 38	Doane	Alan	R	Bloomfield	70%	30%
HD 39	Randall	Lee	R	Broadus	64%	36%
HD 40	McChesney	Bill	D	Miles City	74%	26%
HD 41	Peppers	Patricia	D	Lame Deer	70%	30%
HD 42	Pease-Lopez	Carolyn	D	Billings	70%	30%
HD 43	Ankney	Duane	R	Colstrip	72%	28%
HD 44	McNiven	Jonathan	R	Huntley	74%	26%
HD 45	Berry	Tom	R	Roundup	69%	31%
HD 46	Fiscus	Clayton	R	Billings	69%	31%
HD 47	Zolnikov	Daniel	R	Billings	74%	26%
HD 48	Kary	Douglas	R	Billings	77%	23%
HD 49	McNally	Mary	D	Billings	78%	22%
HD 50	Lenz	Dennis	R	Billings	74%	26%

Information prepared and provided by Matt Leow, Stand with Montanans, mleow@mrss.com, 406-370-3183

**I-166 HD RESULTS (cont.)**

<b>DIST.</b>	<b>LNAME</b>	<b>FNAME</b>	<b>PARTY</b>	<b>CITY</b>	<b>FOR I-166</b>	<b>AGAINST I-166</b>
HD 51	McCarthy	Kelly	D	Billings	77%	23%
HD 52	Court	Virginia	D	Billings	78%	22%
HD 53	Hagstrom	Dave	R	Billings	77%	23%
HD 54	MacDonald	Margie	D	Billings	77%	23%
HD 55	Smith	Cary	R	Billings	75%	25%
HD 56	Jones	Don	R	Billings	73%	27%
HD 57	Laszloffy	Sarah	R	Laurel	69%	31%
HD 58	Kerns	Krayton	R	Laurel	75%	25%
HD 59	Blyton	Joanne	R	Joliet	75%	25%
HD 60	Howard	David	R	Park City	70%	30%
HD 61	Redfield	Alan	R	Livingston	70%	30%
HD 62	Neill	Reilly	D	Livingston	78%	22%
HD 63	Wilmer	Franke	D	Bozeman	76%	24%
HD 64	Woods	Tom	D	Bozeman	81%	19%
HD 65	Williams	Kathleen	D	Bozeman	82%	18%
HD 66	Pomnichowski	Jennifer	D	Bozeman	84%	16%
HD 67	Vance	Gordon	R	Bozeman	75%	25%
HD 68	Flynn	Kelly	R	Townsend	71%	29%
HD 69	Washburn	Ted	R	Bozeman	73%	27%
HD 70	White	Kerry	R	Bozeman	74%	26%
HD 71	Shaw	Ray	R	Sheridan	73%	27%
HD 72	Welborn	Jeffrey	R	Dillon	72%	28%
HD 73	Noonan	Pat	D	Ramsay	79%	21%
HD 74	Lynch	Ryan	D	Butte	77%	23%
HD 75	McClafferty	Edith	D	Butte	79%	21%
HD 76	Curtis	Amanda	D	Butte	78%	22%
HD 77	Wagoner	Kirk	R	Montana City	74%	26%
HD 78	Gibson	Steve	R	East Helena	76%	24%
HD 79	Hunter	Chuck	D	Helena	77%	23%
HD 80	Bangerter	Liz	R	Helena	77%	23%
HD 81	Hollenbaugh	Galen	D	Helena	83%	17%
HD 82	Eck	Jenny	D	Helena	78%	22%
HD 83	Galt	Wylie	R	Martinsdale	73%	27%
HD 84	Miller	Mike	R	Helmville	73%	27%
HD 85	Pierson	Gordon	D	Deer Lodge	79%	21%
HD 86	Swanson	Kathy	D	Anaconda	82%	18%
HD 87	Connell	Patrick	R	Conner	67%	33%
HD 88	Ehli	Ron	R	Hamilton	74%	26%
HD 89	Ballance	Nancy	R	Hamilton	71%	29%
HD 90	Greef	Edward	R	Florence	74%	26%
HD 91	Moore	David	R	Missoula	77%	23%
HD 92	Bennett	Bryce	D	Missoula	83%	17%
HD 93	Coffin	Douglas	D	Missoula	81%	19%
HD 94	Hill	Ellie	D	Missoula	82%	18%
HD 95	Steenberg	Tom	D	Missoula	81%	19%
HD 96	Squires	Carolyn	D	Missoula	80%	20%
HD 97	Wilson	Nancy	D	Missoula	83%	17%
HD 98	Gursky	Jenifer	D	Missoula	79%	21%
HD 99	Dudik	Kimberly	D	Missoula	82%	18%
HD100	Edmunds	Champ	R	Missoula	75%	25%

Information prepared and provided by Matt Leow, Stand with Montanans, mleow@mrss.com, 406-370-3183

## THE COMPLETE TEXT OF INITIATIVE NO. 166 (I-166)

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA:

**NEW SECTION. Section 1. Short title.** [Sections 1 through 4] may be cited as the "Prohibition on Corporate Contributions and Expenditures in Montana Elections Act."

**NEW SECTION. Section 2. Preamble.** The people of the state of Montana find that:

- (1) since 1912, through passage of the Corrupt Practices Act by initiative, Montana has prohibited corporate contributions to and expenditures on candidate elections;
- (2) in 1996, by passage of Initiative No. 125, Montana prohibited corporations from using corporate funds to make contributions to or expenditures on ballot issue campaigns;
- (3) Montana's 1996 prohibition on corporate contributions to ballot issue campaigns was invalidated by *Montana Chamber of Commerce v. Argenbright*, 226 F.3d 1049 (2000). Montana's 1912 prohibition on corporate contributions to and expenditures on candidate elections is also being challenged under the holding of *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. \_\_\_\_, 130 S.Ct. 876 (2010). This decision equated the political speech rights of corporations with those of human beings.
- (4) in 2011 the Montana Supreme Court, in its decision, *Western Tradition Partnership, Inc. v. Attorney General*, 2011 MT 328, upheld Montana's 1912 prohibition on corporate contributions to and expenditures on candidate campaigns, stating in its opinion as follows:
  - (a) examples of well-financed corruption involving corporate money abound in Montana;
  - (b) the corporate power that can be exerted with unlimited corporate political spending is still a vital interest to the people of Montana;
  - (c) corporate independent spending on Montana ballot issues has far exceeded spending from other sources;
  - (d) unlimited corporate money into candidate elections would irrevocably change the dynamic of local Montana political office races;
  - (e) with the infusion of unlimited corporate money in support of or opposition to a targeted candidate, the average citizen candidate in Montana would be unable to compete against the corporate-sponsored candidate, and Montana citizens, who for over 100 years have made their modest election contributions meaningfully count, would be effectively shut out of the process; and
  - (f) clearly the impact of unlimited corporate donations creates a dominating impact on the Montana political process and inevitably minimizes the impact of individual Montana citizens.

**NEW SECTION. Section 3. Policy.** (1) It is policy of the state of Montana that each elected and appointed official in Montana, whether acting on a state or federal level, advance the philosophy that corporations are not human beings with constitutional rights and that each such elected and appointed official is charged to act to prohibit, whenever possible, corporations from making contributions to or expenditures on the campaigns of candidates or ballot issues. As part of this policy, each such elected and appointed official in Montana is charged to promote actions that accomplish a level playing field in election spending.

- (2) When carrying out the policy under subsection (1), Montana's elected and appointed officials are generally directed as follows:
  - (a) that the people of Montana regard money as property, not speech;
  - (b) that the people of Montana regard the rights under the United States Constitution as rights of human beings, not rights of corporations;
  - (c) that the people of Montana regard the immense aggregation of wealth that is accumulated by corporations using advantages provided by the government to be corrosive and distorting when used to advance the political interests of corporations;
  - (d) that the people of Montana intend that there should be a level playing field in campaign spending that allows all individuals, regardless of wealth, to express their views to one another and their government; and
  - (e) that the people of Montana intend that a level playing field in campaign spending includes limits on overall campaign expenditures and limits on large contributions to or expenditures for the benefit of any campaign by any source, including corporations, individuals, or political committees.

**NEW SECTION. Section 4. Promotion of policy by elected or appointed officials.**

- (1) Montana's congressional delegation is charged with proposing a joint resolution offering an amendment to the United States constitution that accomplishes the following:
  - (a) overturns the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*;
  - (b) establishes that corporations are not human beings with constitutional rights;
  - (c) establishes that campaign contributions or expenditures by corporations, whether to candidates or ballot issues, may be prohibited by a political body at any level of government; and
  - (d) accomplishes the goals of Montanans in achieving a level playing field in election spending.
- (2) Montana's congressional delegation is charged to work diligently to bring such a joint resolution to a vote and passage, including use of discharge petitions, cloture, and every other procedural method to secure a vote and passage.
- (3) The members of the Montana legislature, if given the opportunity, are charged with ratifying any amendment to the United States constitution that is consistent with the policy of the state of Montana.

**NEW SECTION. Section 5. Saving clause.** [This act] does not affect rights and duties that matured, penalties that were incurred, or proceedings that were begun before [the effective date of this act.]

**NEW SECTION. Section 6. Severability.** If a part of [this act] is invalid, all valid parts that are severable from the invalid part remain in effect. If a part of [this act] is invalid in one or more of its applications, the part remains in effect in all valid applications that are severable from the invalid applications.

**NEW SECTION. Section 7. Effective date.** [This act] is effective upon approval by the electorate.

**NEW SECTION. Section 8. Codification instruction.** Sections [1 through 4] are intended to be codified as an integral part of Title 13 and the provisions of Title 13 apply to sections [1 through 4].